

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 are all the claims pending in the application, of which claims 15-39 are withdrawn.

**Preliminary Matters**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning the Form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 7, 2009.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

**Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lonnfors et al. (U.S. Patent 6,757,722, hereinafter “Lonnfors”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

***Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, and 14***

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia* (emphasis added):

a presence calculating means for determining the presence information for said presentity provided by said presence service client means based on a change in the presence information for the presentities other than said presentity received by said presence service client means.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lonnfors neither teaches nor suggests this claimed feature. This is because Lonnfors does not disclose “determining the presence information for [a first] presentity...based on a change in the presence information for [a second presentity] other than said [first] presentity,” as recited in claim 1.

Instead, Lonnfors discloses a presence server that provides presence information regarding a monitored presentity’s state. *See* Lonnfors, col. 4, ll. 39-40, 53-67, col. 8, ll. 8-10.

The presence information is received by subscribing user equipment (UE) executing “watcher” applications in the form of a notification that the status of the presentity has changed. *See* Lonnfors, col. 7, ll. 61-67, col. 8, ll. 10-22. That is to say, when the watcher application on the UE is informed that the status of a monitored presentity has changed by the server, the monitored presentity’s status is changed at the UE. *See* Lonnfors, Abstract, col. 6, ll. 44-53, 65-67, col. 7, ll. 61-64. There is no teaching or suggestion that a status of a presentity is changed “based on a change in the presence information for the presentities **other** than said presentity.” In other words, Lonnfors does not disclose the status of a first presentity of a user, who is operating a UE and has their own first presentity, changes based on a change in the second (i.e., “other”) monitored presentity’s status. Similarly, Lonnfors does not disclose that the status of a first, monitored presentity changes when a status of a second, monitored presentity changes.

To the extent the Examiner’s position is based on the assertion that column 1, lines 53 to 65 and column 11, line 60 to column 12, line 13 allegedly teach this feature, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Column 1, lines 53 to 65 of Lonnfors discloses (emphasis added):

Current presence service technology includes the concepts of presentities, presence servers, and watchers. Generally, a presentity can provide information as to its “presence” (e.g., location, willingness to communicate at a certain time or with certain users, etc.). This information can be collected and utilized by presence servers, that can notify authorized “watchers” who are interested in presence information that certain presence information is available. Watcher applications may be implemented in wireline and wireless terminals to obtain presence information from the presence servers about other users. This may come in the form of a notification, issued to the watcher by the presence server.

Accordingly, this portion of Lonnfors discloses that a presence server collects information on presentities (“presence information...about other users”), and this information is

provided to a “watcher”. As discussed above, this presence information is received by subscribing user equipment (UE) executing the “watcher” application in the form of a notification that the status of the monitored presentity (“other user[]”) has changed. *See* Lonnfors, col. 7, ll. 61-67, col. 8, ll. 10-22.

Column 11, line 60 to column 12, line 13, also cited by the Examiner, describes “providing [] notifications to a watcher application” and discloses:

FIG. 5 is a flow diagram illustrating an embodiment of a method for providing partial notifications to a watcher application in accordance with the present invention. Namespace declarations are created 500, including at least one extension namespace declaration for element types and attributes associated with partial notifications. A document-level version may be identified 502, to enable the client/watcher to determine, for example, whether it is in synchronization with the presence server. A mode may be identified 504, to indicate, for example, whether the presence notification provides a complete presence state or whether the presence notification is a partial update. One or more tuples are created 506. A tuple-level version may be identified 508 for any of these one or more tuples. An action(s) may also be identified 510 for one or more of the created tuples. When the presence document has been created, it can be sent to the appropriate watcher application in any desired manner. For example, in one embodiment of the invention, the presence document is sent to a subscribing watcher application when the associated presence information changes. Other manners, such as watcher event-triggered fetching and/or interval polling, may be used.

This portion of Lonnfors discloses that a “presence document” is created for a presentity, and the document is sent to a watcher when the “presence document has been created” or “when the associated presence information changes.”

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to the embodiment illustrated in Figure 7 of Lonnfors, which describes the above procedures. Specifically, “[a]t least one presentity to which a terminal/watcher has requested presence services is identified 700.” *See* Lonnfors, FIG. 7,

S700, col. 12, ll. 50-57. In step 702, a “presence document is created 702, where the presence document includes presence information corresponding to the presentity.” *See* Lonnfors, FIG. 7, S702, col. 12, ll. 57-60. The presence information is configured and transmitted to the terminal that requested the present information. *See* Lonnfors, FIG. 7, S704-706, col. 12, ll. 60-65.

Thus, Lonnfors simply discloses that the presence server informs the watcher of a change in a monitored presentity’s status by using the “presence document.” However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the presence server creates or modifies a “presence document” for a first presentity “based on a change in presence information” for a second presentity. In fact, Lonnfors does not disclose why or how the “presence document” which “corresponds[] to the presentity” is modified to include original, changed, or new presence information. Accordingly, Lonnfors fails to teach or suggest the “presence calculating means for determining the presence information for said presentity...based on a change in the presence information for the presentities other than said presentity,” as recited in claim 1.

As a result, Lonnfors fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, and hence, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims would not have been anticipated by Lonnfors for at least these reasons. To the extent independent claims 3, 9, 10, 13, and 14 recite features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 9, 10, 13, 14, and their dependent claims also would not have been anticipated by Lonnfors for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

**Claims 6 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lonnfors and further in view of Salomaki et al. (WO 02/093959, hereinafter “Salomaki”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 6 and 12 depend on claims 3 and 10, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 3 and 10. Salomaki is cited merely for teaching managing a presence database. Even if Lonnfors and Salomaki could have somehow been combined, the combination still fail to teach or suggest all the features in claims 3 and 10, and hence claims 6 and 12, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 12 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lonnfors and Salomaki for at least these reasons.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**RESPONSE** UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/761,364

Attorney Docket No.: Q79465

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christopher J. Bezak /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Christopher J. Bezak  
Registration No. 63,241

Date: November 9, 2009